Calendar No. 1979

84TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 1961

AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 7), 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3332]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3332) to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The Employment Act of 1946, as amended, provides that the President file his economic report "at the beginning of each regular session." Because of the ambiguity of this requirement the bill would omit this language and provide that the report be filed not later than "January 20" of each year.

The bill would also change the name of the "Joint Committee on the Economic Report" to the "Joint Economic Committee."

This measure has been agreed to by the appropriate executive agencies and both majority and minority members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It is thus a noncontroversial measure.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

As introduced, the bill required that the Economic Report of the President should be filed by January 15 of each year. The Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers have urged that a requirement of filing by January 15 would be difficult to meet, because of the necessity of including within the Economic Report the statistics for the full preceding year. Accordingly, the committee changed the date for the filing of the Economic Report to January 2.

As introduced, the bill contained a section 3, which postponed the date of filing the report of the Joint Committee from March 1 to March 20 of each year. After consideration, it was concluded that it is necessary to file the Joint Committee report by March 1, in order to give time to the legislative committees to consider any legislative proposals which might be proposed by the Joint Committee.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CORDON RULE

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law (secs. 3 and 5 (a) and (b) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended) made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress [at the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947)] *not later than January 20 of each year* an economic report (hereinafter called the "Economic Report") setting forth (1) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2; (2) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (3) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (4) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the Economic Report, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy declared in section 2.

(c) The Economic Report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b), shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 5.

[JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT] *JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE*

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a [Joint Committee on the Economic Report] *Joint Economic Committee*, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the Economic Report;

(2) to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the policy of this Act; and

(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Economic Report, not later than March 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each

of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

The bill also amends references in other statutes to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to be references to the Joint Economic Committee. Since no substantive change is involved in such change in cross-references, the statutes so amended are not set forth.

O

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Calendar No. 1980

84TH CONGRESS, 2d Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 1962

ROADLESS AREA OF THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 7), 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2967]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2967) to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568) and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

S. 2967 would (1) increase by 15,000 acres the lands within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest which may be acquired under the act of June 22, 1948, (2) increase to $2,500,000 (from $500,000) the amount authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of lands under such act, and (3) make section 5 of such act applicable to the additional lands described by the bill on June 30, 1959. Section 5 provides for payment to the State of Minnesota of amounts based on the appraised value of national forest lands in the roadless area rather than forest receipts, as provided by title 16 United States Code, section 500.

The report from the Department of Agriculture, describing the situation covered by the bill and recommending its enactment, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 2967, a bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

We recommend the enactment of S. 2967.

The act of June 22, 1948, to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes, authorizes and directs the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission, to acquire any lands or interest in lands situated within a described part of the Superior National Forest, Minn., where in his opinion development or exploitation, or potentialities for development or exploitation, of such lands impair or threaten to impair the unique qualities and natural features of this area. The described land is part of a designated roadless area within the Superior National Forest and is a wilderness canoeing country of outstanding value. Section 6 of the 1948 act authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $500,000. This sum has been appropriated.

S. 2967 would: (1) extend the provisions of the act of June 22, 1948, to additional lands, which are also within the roadless area; (2) increase to $2,500,000 the sum authorized to be appropriated; and (3) provide that the effective date of application of section 5 of the 1948 act to the lands covered by S. 2967 would be as of the close of fiscal year 1959. Section 5 relates to payments to counties in lieu of taxes of three-quarters of 1 percent of fair value of the national forest lands involved.

The Superior roadless area includes about 1 million acres in the northern part of the Superior National Forest. It is an area of lakes, forests, and streams ideally suited for outdoor recreation, and uniquely adapted for canoeing trips under comparatively primitive conditions. In 1955 an estimated 70,000 canoeists used the area in addition to other recreationists.

For several decades efforts have been in progress to preserve and restore the wilderness conditions of this area. The act of July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020) provided for retention by the Government of Federal lands, preservation of timber along lakes and streams, and maintenance of lake and stream levels within a large area, including the present roadless area. The act of June 22, 1948, provided additional authority for purchase of nonfederal tracts in the northerly two-thirds of the roadless area. Reports by this Department on S. 1090 and H. R. 6420, 80th Congress, discuss the background and problems in this area. The Quetico Provincial Park, a similar area managed for generally similar objectives by the Province of Ontario, adjoins on the north.

Although the act of June 22, 1948, did not apply to all of the roadless area, it did include that portion where action to consolidate public ownership was most urgent at the time. However, the part of the roadless area not covered by the 1948 act is equally important to the public and in order to preserve its wilderness qualities the act of June 22, 1948, needs to be extended.

With respect to our recommendation to increase the appropriation authorization, such increase, if implemented, would permit completion of purchases of privately owned lands in the area covered by the 1948 act and also purchases in the additional area covered by S. 2967. An increased authorization for the area covered by the 1948 act is necessitated by (1) increases in property values in the agea generally, due to a greatly accelerated interest in and use of the lake country of northern Minnesota, and (2) omission in the original estimates of certain properties which now appear desirable.

The substantial investment which the United States already has in the roadless area should be protected and the program of consolidation completed. Property in this area continues to be improved, thus add-

ing to ultimate cost of purchase. Hence, prompt completion of the consolidation program will tend to result in lower total costs than if the program is delayed.

Within the roadless area now covered by the 1948 act there are 24,650 acres in 154 ownerships which should be acquired to meet the purposes of that act. Twenty-six of these ownerships are used for commercial resort purposes, 37 are improved with cabins or other structures, and 91 are unimproved. Within the roadless area not covered by the 1948 act to which S. 2967 would apply there are 96 properties comprising 15,000 acres, of which 5 are used for commercial resorts, 36 have other improvements, and 55 are unimproved. It is estimated that the lands and properties still to be acquired in the roadless area covered by both the 1948 act and S. 2967 will require an additional $2 million. Accordingly, it is recommended that the appropriation authorization be increased from $500,000 to $2,500,000.

With respect to the item in S. 2967 regarding national forest receipts: Section 5 of the act of June 22, 1948, provides for payment to the State from national forest receipts, for distribution to counties in which the described lands are situated, of three-fourths of 1 percent of the fair appraised value of national forest land in the described area, and for reappraisal of such value at 10-year intervals. Such reappraisal will next occur in fiscal year 1959; hence the reason for making the close of fiscal year 1959 the effective date of application of section 5 of the 1948 act to the area covered by S. 2967. In the interim, the provisions of the acts of May 23, 1908, and March 1, 1911, (16 U. S. C. 500), which direct payment of 25 percent of the receipts from the national forest to the State, for benefit of schools and roads of the counties where the national forest lands are situated, would continue to apply to this area.

Although the general policy of this Department is not to favor increasing the Federal acreage in national forests, we believe for the reasons stated above that the Superior roadless area is a justified exception to this policy. Enactment of S. 2967 therefore is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

○

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Calendar No. 1981

84TH CONGRESS, 2d Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 1963

AMENDING TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 30, 1954, ENTITLED "AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER"

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 7), 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7228]

The Committee on the District of Columbia to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7228) to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An Act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River at or near Jones Point, Va., so that the Secretary of Commerce, rather than the Secretary of Interior, would be charged with the responsibility of constructing such bridge. The bill also contains amendments that would permit a more economical and advantageous design of the bridge. This measure would also amend existing law so as to provide that the bridge will be maintained and operated by the States of Virginia and Maryland.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce addressed to the President of the Senate, explaining the need for this legislation, is herewith made a part of this report.

JUNE 10, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith is a draft of proposed bill to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "an act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

The President, at the time of his approval of the act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 963), title II of which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Potomac

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

River at or near Jones Point, Va., issued a statement that title II improperly vests responsibilities in the Department of the Interior, which is not a construction agency. His statement pointed out that such responsibilities should be placed in the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, or in the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, and that the act should be amended to correct this defect.

The attached draft bill would amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, so as to transfer the responsibility for the construction of the Jones Point Bridge from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce. It also contains certain amendments to permit a more economical and advantageous design of the bridge, and to provide that the bridge will be maintained and operated by the States of Virginia and Maryland.

The Department of Commerce recommends this proposed legislation for the favorable consideration of the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the draft legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law in the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PUBLIC LAW 704, 83D CONGRESS

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—BRIDGE IN VICINITY OF JONES POINT

[SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (referred to hereinafter as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Virginia, across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia.

[(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder structure with a swing span having a one-hundred-and-fifty-foot horizontal clearance on each side of the pivot pier and a seventy-foot vertical clearance above mean low water, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of Section 502 of the "General Bridge Act of 1946," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 847), as amended, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this title.

[(c) The Secretary shall request recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of such bridge and approaches.]

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (referred to hereinafter as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to construct a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Virginia,

across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia: Provided, That nothing in this section or in other sections of this Act shall be construed as authorizing or as requiring the Secretary to construct any ingress or egress approaches to the bridge which will directly connect with or empty into those streets within the corporate limits of the city of Alexandria, Virginia, which are east of Mount Vernon Boulevard (now known as Washington Street) and are now known as Potomac Street, South Lee Street, South Fairfax Street, South Royal Street, South Pitt Street, South St. Asaph Street, Green Street, and Jefferson Street.

(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder construction, with a movable span of the double-leaf bascule type over the navigable channel having horizontal clearance of approximately one hundred and fifty feet and vertical clearance above mean low water of approximately forty feet, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 502 of the "General Bridge Act of 1946," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 847), as amended, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this title.

(c) The Secretary shall request the recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of such bridge and approaches and shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to all plans for overpasses, approaches, interchanges, and connecting roads of both ends of the bridge which affect lands and facilities administered or authorized to be administered by the Department of the Interior.

(d) Upon the completion of the bridge project all lands acquired pursuant to this Act that are located within the authorized boundaries of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, with the exception of such portions thereof that shall be actually occupied by the bridge structure and main approaches leading thereto and the bridge itself, shall be under the administrative control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the Parkway.

SEC. 202. (a) Any Federal agency and the District of Columbia having control and jurisdiction over any land at or near the site of the bridge shall transfer to the Secretary, upon his request, any such lands to be occupied by the bridge or approaches thereto.

(b) The Secretary may acquire by purchase or by condemnation any land in the State of Maryland, not under Federal or District jurisdiction or control, needed for the construction of such bridge, title to such land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States. In case a price satisfactory to the Secretary cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of such land or in case the title cannot be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to procure such land by condemnation, and the expenses of procuring evidence of title, or condemnation, or both, shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this title.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary may make such use of lands owned or controlled by the United States, at or adjacent to the site of the bridge, as may be necessary for making borings, performing other prelininary work, routing and rerouting traffic, constructing such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, and storing materials incident to such preliminary work and to actual construction.

90003°—57 S. Rept., 84–2, vol. 3——18

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(b) The Secretary may route and reroute and cause the routing and rerouting of traffic on, and close or cause to be closed, streets, roads, and highways under the jurisdiction of the United States, and negotiate for the closing of streets, roads, and highways by contact with Virginia, Maryland, and District authorities, when necessary in connection with the preparation of plans for, and during the actual construction of, the bridge.

SEC. 204. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary shall not begin construction of the bridge above referred to until the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland have taken such steps as the Secretary deems adequate to give assurances that there will be constructed and maintained, by and in such States, such approaches to such bridge as will be reasonably adequate to make possible the full and efficient utilization of such bridge *and that such bridge will be maintained and operated by the said States.*

O

Calendar No. 1982

84TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 1964

DESIGNATING THE BRIDGE TO BE CONSTRUCTED OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF JONES POINT, VA., AS THE "WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE"

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 7), 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8130]

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8130) to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge," having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this legislation is to designate a bridge to be constructed across the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, as authorized under Public Law 704 of the 83d Congress, as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge."

A subcommittee of your committee held a public hearing on May 9, 1956, at which time it was pointed out that the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission was established by Congress to develop suitable plans for celebrating 1956 as the centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. The Commission believes that one suitable way of marking the centennial would be to name the bridge to be constructed at Jones Point in honor of our 28th President. The naming of the bridge for Woodrow Wilson would stand as an enduring reminder of his achievements long after the present centennial year has passed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

84TH CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1965

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 7), 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

[To accompany H. R. 10660]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred title I of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is indicated in the bill as reported by linetype and italics.

Title I of H. R. 10660 contains the authorization for continuing and expanding the Federal-aid highway program and was referred to the Committee on Public Works for consideration and report.

During the first session of the 84th Congress, the committee held extensive public hearings on proposed Federal-aid highway legislation. A bill, S. 1048, was reported by the committee and passed by the Senate on May 25, 1955. That bill authorized a program for the regular and interstate Federal-aid systems totalling $12.25 billion and covering a period of 5 fiscal years. Details of the bill and its justification are outlined in Senate Report No. 350, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The committee has given careful consideration to title I of H. R. 10660. It is aware of the fact that the highway problem is still exceedingly acute, and that initiation of an accelerated long-range highway program in the immediate future is essential. The matter of holding additional hearings was discussed, but the committee believes

★

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that such hearings would be largely repetitious, and it was decided that the procedure is unnecessary. The committee recommends that the substance of the Senate bill, with the program for the National System of Interstate Highways extended to cover a period of 13 years, be substituted for title I of H. R. 10660.

This report includes the separate opinions of those members of the committee who wish to express their individual views on the legislation.

General Statement

After considering the various bills and the testimony presented, the committee still believes that the essence of the Senate bill contains the best approach to meeting the growing needs of improving the Nation's highways. In making these recommendations, the committee has adhered to the basic principles underlying the established Federal-aid highway programs, with emphasis on certain phases of the program, yet providing a balanced program in keeping with the needs reflected by the evidence received.

It was stated in the committee report on the Senate bill, S. 1048, that the authorizations contained therein would constitute only the first installment of an adequate highway program, and that later review of such program may warrant its modification to meet conditions prevailing at that time. The committee still believes that a periodical review and evaluation of the program is desirable.

The committee recommends that the program for the Interstate System be extended to cover a period of 13 years, the same as the House Bill. This expansion of the Interstate Highway System, insofar as the estimated costs are concerned, will permit the proposed financing to match the authorizations, and keep the financing and construction programs in balance.

The Senate amendment proposes the launching of a vast new program for improving and modernizing the Interstate System. The longer period of authorization will permit advance preparation and planning by the States, but the progress of the program should be reexamined and reviewed periodically, and adjustments made as the actualities of construction advance. This periodic review will present an opportunity for any legislative modifications found necessary.

The committee considered most carefully the question of apportionment of funds to the several States. At the outset the committee deemed it essential that Congress should retain exclusive control of the apportionment of Federal funds so as to fulfill its constitutional responsibility over the expenditure of tax revenues. To meet this responsibility it is necessary that a definite formula governing the apportionment of funds be written into the law. Such formula must be equitable to all States and must provide for a coordinated program of highway development in accordance with the objectives of the bill.

Under existing law, funds for the primary, secondary and urban segments of the Federal-aid system are apportioned one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of the mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes. In the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, Congress recognized that the traditional formula did not meet the requirements for highway improvement on the National System of Interstate Highways. Accordingly, that act provided that greater weight be given to population,

and the congestion which accompanies it, in the distribution of Interstate Highway funds to the several States. Since passage of the 1954 act, Interstate funds have been apportioned two-thirds on the basis of population, one-sixth on the basis of area, and one-sixth on the basis of mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes. This formula represented the best judgment of Congress at that time. Experience gained since the formula was revised has disclosed no evidence that it is inequitable or that it fails to meet the requirements of the Interstate System. S. 1048 reported by this committee and passed by the Senate last year retained this formula.

It should be pointed out that the House bill retains the formula of existing law for apportionment of primary, secondary and urban funds. The House bill, however, departs entirely from the existing formula with respect to Interstate funds. As a matter of fact, the House bill, as to Interstate funds, contains no apportionment formula at all in the sense in which that term has come to be known in connection with highway legislation.

The House bill provides that, for the first 2 years, interstate funds shall be distributed on the basis of the so-called needs table appearing on page 6 of House Document 120, 84th Congress. The figures contained in this table were compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads from estimates submitted by the various States as to the expected cost of correcting critical deficiencies in their highway systems. No standard criteria were used by the several States in submitting their estimates. Obviously many of the estimates are low. Few of them were based upon the objective surveys of probable actual cost. An analysis of these estimates, when related to interstate mileage and terrain within the States, indicates that they are in large measure unrealistic. For example, the State of New Jersey having within its borders 102 miles of rural highways and 102 miles of urban highways, designated on the Interstate System at the time the study was made, estimated its needs as $1.357 billion for completing its Interstate System. The estimate submitted for the neighboring State of Pennsylvania having 1,068 miles of rural and 296 miles of urban highways on the Interstate System was only $760 million. The committee believes it would be wholly unsound to initiate so important a program with apportionment of funds calculated on so inequitable a basis.

The House bill provides that the apportionment of interstate funds for subsequent years shall be made on the basis of new and revised estimates to be submitted from time to time. Authorized funds for the last 11 years of the program remain unapportioned by the House bill. No State will be able to plan its program intelligently without some knowledge as to the amount of funds to become available in the year ahead.

The committee is also disturbed by the basic fallacy underlying the proposal of the House bill. Under the House bill the percentage of available funds accruing to each State will depend upon the amount of the estimate heretofore or hereafter submitted by the State itself with respect to its needs. More specifically, each State's share would depend in large measure upon its ability to convince the Bureau of Public Roads of the accuracy of its estimates. Whatever may be said about the efficacy of distribution of Federal funds on the basis of need, the committee considers it contrary to the public interest to initiate a policy of distributing Federal funds on the basis of what each State claims it needs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

After full deliberation, the committee considered that it should adhere to the formula contained in existing law and as approved by the Senate when it passed S. 1048. Should further experience indicate that revision is necessary or desirable, Congress can always enact such changes as may be required without in any way departing from the time-tested principle of an apportionment formula fixed by the Congress itself and written into law in definite terms.

The committee emphasizes that the program authorized herein is not one by which the Federal Government will construct highways, but a Federal-aid program within the framework of existing laws, rules, and procedures. Administration by the Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with the State highway departments, will permit maximum flexibility in meeting the needs of the States. It is the intention to retain the basic structure of existing law without disturbing the present relationship between the Bureau of Public Roads and the States, nor the rights of the States in planning their programs and laying out the location of their highways. It is realized that considerable care must be exercised by the States in establishing their priority of construction.

The committee recognizes the apprehension of people in some quarters that the Interstate System could parallel or compete with present toll roads. No provision on this is suggested in the bill because the committee believes that complete control of the location and construction of the Interstate System by the States, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, gives each State complete protection in this matter, and that is the intent of the committee.

The committee would also like to explain that funds authorized under the Senate amendment are not to be advanced to the States to construct the highways, but that such funds are to be used to reimburse the States for the work that has been performed. Such reimbursements are made on the basis of vouchers properly executed and certified by the State officials. In this connection, it can thus be seen that apportionment of funds authorized for the Interstate System, with subsequent reimbursement to the States for their expenditures, will be made only to the extent of completing the Interstate System in the States to established standards.

The committee is cognizant of the serious impact upon our economy resulting from the wide right-of-way necessary, the controlled access aspects, the large milage of new locations that must be utilized, and the existing commercial developments and small communities on present routes that must be acquired, relocated, or bypassed. Most of the States now have controlled-access laws, but they have not been used extensively. The general public is not fully aware of the characteristic of roads of this type, and an educational program wil. be necessary. When their vast advantages from economic and safety standpoints are observed, it is believed that they will be well received by the motoring public.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FEDERAL-AID SYSTEMS

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 authorized a continuance of the Federal-aid highway program for fiscal years 1956 and 1957, with an increased annual authorization. The amount authorized for the

various systems for the past several years are shown in the following table:

[Millions of dollars]

System	Federal-Aid Highway Act of—			
	1948	1950	1952	1954
Primary	$202.5	$225	$247.5	$315
Secondary	135.0	150	165.0	210
Urban	112.5	125	137.5	175
Subtotal	450.0	500	550.0	700
Interstate	0	0	25.0	175
Total	450.0	500	575.0	875

The funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 for the year 1957 have been apportioned to the States and will be available on July 1, 1956. Reports indicate that progress on the highway programs with Federal-aid funds is proceeding satisfactorily, but that many States have deferred their planning and construction programs and financing arrangements, awaiting legislative decision on the Federal-aid program, before determining their future course of action.

The committee recommends authorizations for the primary, secondary, and urban segments of our Federal-aid systems in the following amounts: an additional $200 million for fiscal year 1957, and $900 million for each of the fiscal years 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961.

By increasing the funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems above the level now in effect, the committee desired to avoid an unbalanced program that would permit further deterioration of the primary, secondary, and urban systems, so vital to our economy. As great as the need for completing the Interstate System may be, it should not be undertaken at the expense of the secondary and farm-to-market roads. Because of the limited access features of the Interstate System, it may become increasingly necessary to construct additional secondary roads in agricultural areas penetrated by that system. If Federal funds for these secondary roads are held at a low level, genuine hardship could result to the rural people who rely upon public highways to get their products to market. A well-balanced program of expansion on all road systems is believed essential to the national welfare.

The House bill authorizes $25 million additional for fiscal year 1957, $750 million for fiscal year 1958, and $775 million for fiscal year 1959. In addition, it declares the intent of Congress to progressively increase the annual sums authorized for the regular Federal-aid systems by $25 million annually over those authorized for the preceding fiscal year for fiscal years 1960–69. This expressed intent would provide a total of $9.125 billion over the additional 10-year period.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The authorizations for the three regular Federal-aid systems contained in both the House bill and Senate amendment, and the allocation between the categories, is shown in the following tabulation:

FEDERAL-AID SYSTEMS

Authorizations in H. R. 10660

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate amendment	Fiscal years	House bill	Senate amendment
Already apportioned, 1957	700	700	1960		900
1957	25	200	1961		900
1958	750	900			
1959	775	900	Total	2,250	4,500

House bill

[Millions of dollars]

	Primary system	Secondary system	Urban system	Total
1957	326.25	217.50	181.25	725
1958	337.50	225.00	187.50	750
1959	348.75	232.50	193.75	775
Total	1,012.50	675.00	562.50	2,250

Senate amendment

[Millions of dollars]

	Primary system	Secondary system	Urban system	Total
1957	405	270	225	900
1958	400	300	200	900
1959	400	300	200	900
1960	400	300	200	900
1961	400	300	200	900
Total	2,005	1,470	1,025	4,500

The apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and the authorizations contained in the Senate amendment, for fiscal year 1957, is shown in the following table:

Approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660, as amended, and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954—authorization for fiscal year 1957

[Millions]

State	1954 act					H. R. 10660					Total ($2,075)
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)	Primary ($90)	Secondary ($60)	Urban ($50)	Interstate ($1,000)	Total ($1,200)	
Alabama	$6.7	$5.2	$2.3	$3.5	$17.7	$1.9	$1.5	$0.7	$20.3	$24.4	$42.1
Arizona	4.7	3.2	.7	2.0	10.6	1.4	.9	.2	11.5	14.0	24.6
Arkansas	5.3	4.2	1.0	2.5	13.0	1.5	1.2	.3	14.5	17.5	30.5
California	14.5	7.5	15.4	9.8	47.2	4.2	2.2	4.5	57.0	67.9	115.1
Colorado	5.7	3.8	1.5	2.3	13.3	1.7	1.1	.4	13.7	16.9	30.2
Connecticut	2.0	1.0	3.4	1.7	8.1	.6	.3	1.0	9.6	11.5	19.6
Delaware	1.6	1.0	.4	1.1	4.1	.5	.3	.1	6.3	7.2	11.3
Florida	5.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	14.5	1.5	1.0	.9	17.0	20.4	34.9
Georgia	7.8	6.0	2.5	4.1	20.4	2.2	1.7	.7	23.3	27.9	48.3
Idaho	3.9	2.7	.3	1.7	8.6	1.1	.8	.1	10.1	12.1	20.7
Illinois	12.2	6.6	12.1	8.1	39.0	3.5	1.9	3.5	47.1	56.0	95.0
Indiana	7.5	5.2	4.2	4.2	21.1	2.1	1.5	1.2	24.3	29.1	50.2
Iowa	7.6	5.6	2.1	3.5	18.8	2.2	1.6	.6	20.4	24.8	43.6
Kansas	7.6	5.4	1.6	3.2	17.8	2.2	1.5	.5	18.1	22.3	40.1
Kentucky	5.9	4.9	1.8	3.2	15.8	1.7	1.4	.5	18.8	22.4	38.2
Louisiana	4.9	3.6	2.5	2.8	13.8	1.4	1.1	.7	16.5	19.7	33.5
Maine	2.7	1.9	.7	1.4	6.7	.8	.6	.2	8.0	9.6	16.3
Maryland	2.8	1.7	2.9	2.0	9.4	.8	.5	.8	12.0	14.1	23.5
Massachusetts	4.0	1.5	7.2	3.7	16.4	1.2	.4	2.1	21.3	25.0	41.4
Michigan	9.9	6.0	8.1	6.2	30.2	2.8	1.7	2.3	36.0	42.8	73.0
Minnesota	8.3	5.9	2.8	4.0	21.0	2.4	1.7	.8	22.5	27.4	48.4
Mississippi	5.6	4.7	1.0	2.8	14.1	1.6	1.4	.3	15.9	19.2	33.3
Missouri	9.2	6.2	4.3	4.7	24.4	2.6	1.8	1.2	27.1	32.7	57.1
Montana	6.3	4.3	.4	2.4	13.4	1.9	1.3	.1	14.4	17.7	31.1
Nebraska	6.1	4.3	1.0	2.4	13.8	1.8	1.3	.3	14.3	17.7	31.5
Nevada	4.1	2.7	.2	1.8	8.8	1.2	.8	.1	10.4	12.5	21.3
New Hampshire	1.6	1.0	.5	1.1	4.2	.5	.3	.2	6.3	7.3	11.5
New Jersey	4.1	1.4	7.6	3.8	16.9	1.2	.4	2.2	21.9	25.7	42.6
New Mexico	5.1	3.5	.6	2.1	11.3	1.5	1.0	.2	12.1	14.8	26.1
New York	14.9	6.0	23.2	12.2	56.3	4.3	1.8	6.7	70.9	83.7	140.0
North Carolina	7.9	6.7	2.2	4.4	21.2	2.3	1.9	.6	25.5	30.3	51.5
North Dakota	4.6	3.4	.3	1.9	10.2	1.3	1.0	.1	11.1	13.5	23.7
Ohio	11.0	6.7	10.0	7.4	35.1	3.2	1.9	2.9	42.8	50.8	85.9
Oklahoma	6.8	4.9	1.9	3.1	16.7	1.9	1.4	.6	17.9	21.8	38.5
Oregon	5.4	3.8	1.4	2.3	12.9	1.6	1.1	.4	13.6	16.7	29.6
Pennsylvania	12.4	7.4	13.1	9.2	42.1	3.7	2.2	3.8	53.6	63.3	105.4
Rhode Island	1.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	4.9	.5	.3	.4	6.3	7.5	12.4
South Carolina	4.3	3.6	1.2	2.3	11.4	1.2	1.0	.3	13.4	15.9	27.3
South Dakota	5.0	3.6	.3	2.0	10.9	1.4	1.0	.1	11.6	14.1	25.0

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660, as amended, and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954—authorization for fiscal year 1957—Continued

[Millions]

State	1954 act					H. R. 10660					Total ($2,075)
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)	Primary ($90)	Secondary ($60)	Urban ($50)	Interstate ($1,000)	Total ($1,200)	
Tennessee	$8.9	$5.3	$2.5	$3.7	$18.4	$2.0	$1.5	$0.7	$21.4	$25.6	$44.0
Texas	20.6	13.8	8.3	9.9	52.6	5.9	4.0	2.4	57.5	69.8	122.4
Utah	3.6	2.4	.7	1.7	8.4	1.1	.7	.2	9.7	11.7	20.1
Vermont	1.6	1.0	.3	1.1	4.0	.5	.3	.1	6.3	7.2	11.2
Virginia	6.0	4.7	2.7	3.5	16.9	1.8	1.4	.8	20.2	24.2	41.1
Washington	5.2	3.5	2.6	2.8	14.1	1.5	1.0	.8	16.1	19.4	33.5
West Virginia	3.5	3.0	1.1	2.1	9.7	1.0	.9	.3	11.9	14.1	23.8
Wisconsin	7.5	5.2	3.4	3.9	20.0	2.1	1.5	1.0	22.8	27.4	47.4
Wyoming	3.9	2.7	.2	1.7	8.5	1.2	.8	.1	10.4	12.5	21.0
Hawaii	1.6	1.0	.6	----------	3.2	.5	.3	.2	----------	1.0	4.2
District of Columbia	1.6	1.0	1.5	1.1	5.2	.5	.3	.4	6.3	7.5	12.7
Puerto Rico	1.6	1.7	1.5	----------	4.8	.5	.5	.4	----------	1.4	6.2

The amounts authorized for the Interstate System are shown in the following tabulation:

Interstate System

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate amendment	Fiscal years	House bill	Senate amendment
Already apportioned, 1957	175	175	1964	2,300	2,000
1957 (additional)	1,025	1,000	1965	2,300	2,000
1958	1,700	1,750	1966	2,200	2,000
1959	2,000	2,000	1967	2,000	2,000
1960	2,200	2,000	1968	1,500	2,000
1961	2,200	2,000	1969	1,000	2,000
1962	2,200	2,000			
1963	2,200	2,000	Total	25,000	24,925

The funds for the Interstate System will be matched on a 90-percent Federal and 10-percent State basis. Funds authorized for the other systems will be matched on a 50–50 basis as provided by existing law. The approximate amounts which will be apportioned to each State under the Senate amendment are shown in the following tables:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Approximate apportionments of interstate highway funds, pursuant to H. R. 10660 as amended

[Millions]

States	Fiscal year 1957 ($1,000)	Fiscal year 1958 ($1,750)	Each of fiscal years 1959–69, inclusive ($2,000 annually)	Total[1] ($24,750)
Alabama	$20.3	$35.6	$40.6	$502.8
Arizona	11.5	20.1	22.9	283.6
Arkansas	14.5	25.4	29.1	359.6
California	57.0	99.8	114.1	1,411.4
Colorado	13.7	23.9	27.3	338.3
Connecticut	9.6	16.9	19.3	238.3
Delaware	6.3	10.9	12.5	154.7
Florida	17.0	29.8	34.0	420.8
Georgia	23.3	40.8	46.6	576.8
Idaho	10.1	17.7	20.2	250.5
Illinois	47.1	82.5	94.3	1,166.9
Indiana	24.3	42.6	48.6	602.1
Iowa	20.4	35.7	40.8	505.6
Kansas	18.1	31.8	36.3	449.2
Kentucky	18.8	32.8	37.5	464.2
Louisiana	16.5	28.9	33.0	408.5
Maine	8.0	14.1	16.1	199.0
Maryland	12.0	21.0	24.0	296.9
Massachusetts	21.3	37.4	42.7	528.4
Michigan	36.0	62.9	71.9	889.8
Minnesota	22.5	39.4	45.1	557.6
Mississippi	15.9	27.8	31.7	392.5
Missouri	27.1	47.4	54.2	670.4
Montana	14.4	25.1	28.7	355.5
Nebraska	14.3	25.1	28.7	355.0
Nevada	10.4	18.3	20.9	258.4
New Hampshire	6.3	10.9	12.5	154.7
New Jersey	21.9	38.3	43.8	542.1
New Mexico	12.1	21.2	24.3	300.5
New York	70.9	124.1	141.8	1,754.6
North Carolina	25.5	44.6	51.0	631.0
North Dakota	11.1	19.4	22.2	274.4
Ohio	42.8	74.9	85.6	1,059.8
Oklahoma	17.9	31.3	35.8	442.8
Oregon	13.6	23.8	27.2	336.0
Pennsylvania	53.6	93.8	107.2	1,326.8
Rhode Island	6.3	10.9	12.5	154.7
South Carolina	13.4	23.5	26.9	332.8
South Dakota	11.6	20.3	23.2	286.6
Tennessee	21.4	37.4	42.8	529.2
Texas	57.5	100.6	114.9	1,422.4
Utah	9.7	17.1	19.5	241.2
Vermont	6.3	10.9	12.5	154.7
Virginia	20.2	35.4	40.5	501.0
Washington	16.1	28.1	32.1	397.5
West Virginia	11.9	20.8	23.8	294.8
Wisconsin	22.8	39.9	45.5	563.7
Wyoming	10.4	18.2	20.8	257.2
Hawaii				
District of Columbia	6.3	10.9	12.5	154.7
Puerto Rico				

[1] Does not include $175 million authorized for fiscal year 1957 in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954.

Approximate apportionments of Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 as amended—Authorizations for each of fiscal years 1958 to 1961, inclusive

[Millions]

	Annual amount			
	Primary ($400)	Secondary ($300)	Urban ($200)	Total ($900)
Alabama	$8.5	$7.5	$2.6	$18.6
Arizona	6.1	4.7	.8	11.6
Arkansas	6.8	6.1	1.1	14.0
California	18.9	11.0	17.9	47.8
Colorado	7.5	5.7	1.7	14.9
Connecticut	2.6	1.5	3.9	8.0
Delaware	2.0	1.5	.4	3.9
Florida	6.6	4.9	3.6	15.1
Georgia	9.9	8.6	2.9	21.4
Idaho	5.1	4.0	.4	9.5
Illinois	15.7	9.6	14.1	39.4
Indiana	9.5	7.4	4.8	21.7
Iowa	9.7	8.0	2.4	20.1
Kansas	9.7	7.6	1.9	19.2
Kentucky	7.6	7.0	2.1	16.7
Louisiana	6.4	5.2	3.0	14.6
Maine	3.4	2.8	.8	7.0
Maryland	3.7	2.5	3.4	9.6
Massachusetts	5.3	2.2	8.4	15.9
Michigan	12.7	8.7	9.3	30.7
Minnesota	10.5	8.3	3.3	22.1
Mississippi	7.2	6.7	1.1	15.0
Missouri	11.7	8.9	4.9	25.5
Montana	8.4	6.5	.5	15.4
Nebraska	8.1	6.4	1.2	15.7
Nevada	5.3	4.0	.2	9.5
New Hampshire	2.0	1.5	.6	4.1
New Jersey	5.3	2.1	8.8	16.2
New Mexico	6.7	5.1	.7	12.5
New York	19.3	8.8	26.9	55.0
North Carolina	10.1	9.7	2.6	22.4
North Dakota	5.8	4.8	.3	10.9
Ohio	14.2	9.7	11.7	35.6
Oklahoma	8.6	7.0	2.2	17.8
Oregon	7.0	5.5	1.6	14.1
Pennsylvania	16.4	11.0	15.2	42.6
Rhode Island	2.0	1.5	1.4	4.9
South Carolina	5.4	5.1	1.4	11.9
South Dakota	6.2	5.0	.4	11.6
Tennessee	8.8	7.7	2.9	19.4
Texas	26.4	19.9	9.7	56.0
Utah	4.8	3.5	.9	9.2
Vermont	2.0	1.5	.3	3.8
Virginia	7.8	6.8	3.1	17.7
Washington	6.8	5.1	3.1	15.0
West Virginia	4.5	4.4	1.3	10.2
Wisconsin	9.6	7.5	3.9	21.0
Wyoming	5.3	4.0	.2	9.5
Hawaii	2.0	1.5	.7	4.2
District of Columbia	2.0	1.5	1.7	5.2
Puerto Rico	2.1	2.5	1.7	6.3

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The comparative summary of programs authorized herein with the Federal and State matching funds, and the Federal Interstate funds authorized for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 combined, are included in the following tables:

Comparative summary of program

FEDERAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED [1]

[Millions]

Systems	H. R. 10660	Senate amendment
Primary, secondary, and urban	[2] $2,250	[2] $4,500
Interstate	25,000	24,925
Public domain roads	190	330
Total Federal funds	27,440	29,755
STATE MATCHING FUNDS		
Primary, secondary, and urban, 50-50	2,250	4,500
Interstate, 90-10	2,778	2,770
Total State funds	5,028	7,270
Total highway program	32,468	37,025

[1] Includes apportionments for fiscal year 1957.
[2] 3-year program.
[3] 5-year program.

Approximate apportionments of interstate funds authorized for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 combined, H. R. 10660 and Senate amendment [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	H. R. 10660 ($2,725,000)	Senate amendment ($2,750,000)		H. R. 10660 ($2,725,000)	Senate amendment ($2,750,000)
Alabama	42.8	55.9	New Hampshire	7.9	17.2
Arizona	24.5	31.6	New Jersey	159.1	60.2
Arkansas	23.7	39.9	New Mexico	27.5	33.3
California	271.9	156.8	New York	156.7	195.0
Colorado	18.3	37.6	North Carolina	28.9	70.1
Connecticut	65.1	26.5	North Dakota	12.5	30.5
Delaware	7.6	17.2	Ohio	159.4	117.7
Florida	58.0	46.8	Oklahoma	44.1	49.2
Georgia	82.0	64.1	Oregon	37.3	37.4
Idaho	12.5	27.8	Pennsylvania	89.1	147.4
Illinois	124.8	129.6	Rhode Island	14.4	17.3
Indiana	101.6	66.9	South Carolina	21.5	36.9
Iowa	32.4	56.1	South Dakota	11.2	31.9
Kansas	24.3	49.9	Tennessee	44.4	58.8
Kentucky	57.8	51.6	Texas	102.2	158.1
Louisiana	57.8	45.4	Utah	28.0	26.8
Maine	17.2	22.1	Vermont	20.7	17.2
Maryland	51.0	33.0	Virginia	66.8	55.6
Massachusetts	98.1	58.7	Washington	54.8	44.2
Michigan	151.8	98.9	West Virginia	30.2	32.7
Minnesota	56.7	61.9	Wisconsin	37.9	62.7
Mississippi	28.9	43.7	Wyoming	34.6	28.6
Missouri	70.0	74.5	Hawaii		
Montana	18.0	39.5	District of Columbia	17.7	17.2
Nebraska	12.5	39.4	Puerto Rico		
Nevada	8.7	28.7			

Does not include $175,000,000 previously authorized for fiscal year 1957.

INCREASE IN MILEAGE

Since there remains no undesignated mileage of that authorized for the Interstate System, the committee recommends an increase in the mileage limitation from 40,000 miles to 42,500. This increase appears desirable to render the Interstate System fully effective, and permit additional urban connections and bypasses and important interstate connections found necessary at a later date.

FEDERALLY BUILT ROADS ON OR TO FEDERALLY OWNED OR CONTROLLED LANDS

The committee amendment would extend the present authorizations for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, and roads on Indian reservations, for fiscal years 1958 through 1961. This will not disturb the existing authorizations for fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Funds available for forest development roads and trails were also made available for provision of sanitary, water, and fire control facilities, where needed. It was understood that the cost of the desired facilities would be very nominal, but that they are desirable to provide for the safety and comfort of the increased number of persons using those roads. The House bill increases the authorizations for these designations slightly for fiscal years 1958 and 1959, and expresses the intent of Congress to continue the authorizations at annual rates no less than those in H. R. 10660 through fiscal year 1969.

The funds authorized for the public lands roads were increased to $2 million annually for fiscal year 1956 through 1961. The committee was advised that the present backlog of requests for funds of this category is in excess of $5 million.

A comparative table of the authorizations for these miscellaneous Federal roads in the House bill and the Senate amendment is shown in the following tabulation:

[Millions of dollars]

Type	House bill, fiscal years 1958–59	Senate amendment, fiscal years 1958–61
Forest highways	25	22.5
Forest development roads and trails	27	24
Park roads and trails	16	12.5
Parkways	16	11
Indian roads	10	10
Public lands	1	[1] 2
Subtotal	95	82
Total for period	190	330

[1] 1956–61. Present authorization $1 million for 1956 and 1957.

WEIGHTS AND DIMENSIONS

The Senate amendment includes provisions to withhold apportionment of funds for the Interstate System from any State which increases its authorized maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles over those permitted under laws in effect on July 1, 1956, where such laws now permit weights and dimensions equal to or in excess of the uniform standards recommended by the American Association of State High-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

way Officials; or from any State which increases its allowable weights and dimensions in excess of the recommended uniform standards where such weights and dimensions are now below such standards. The House bill establishes a limitation on maximum axle loadings, but does not refer to dimensions or total weight.

UTILITY RELOCATIONS

The committee feels that there is some justification for reimbursing utilities for a portion of their cost of relocation in States where under the laws or practices of the State in which the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility. Where a State now includes the cost of relocation as a proper charge against the construction cost of a highway, that expense is included in the total construction cost for which the State is reimbursed by the Federal Government to the extent of the Federal share. It is recommended that 50 percent of relocation costs may be paid from Federal funds, provided that no more than 2 percent of any sum apportioned to any State for any fiscal year may be expended in connection with projects prosecuted on the Federal-aid highway system for which such sums are used.

LABOR PROVISIONS

The original Senate bill reported by the committee included provisions that the Davis-Bacon Act apply to all construction projects on the Interstate System, but the provisions were deleted on the Senate floor. The committee feels that it should be guided by the will of the Senate as expressed during debate on S. 1048 during the last session, and accordingly, has not included the Davis-Bacon provisions in H. R. 10660, as reported.

REIMBURSEMENT

The House bill includes a provision declaring the intent and policy of Congress to reimburse those States which have constructed toll or free highways which are incorporated into the final location of the Interstate System, and meets the standards required for such system. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a study and report to Congress on this matter. The committee is opposed to such reimbursement, although it is favorable to development of toll roads where economically feasible and where needed to care for traffic demands as a supplement to free highways. However, these toll roads are paid for by the users, and retirement of bonds at taxpayers expense is not believed desirable. The States and localities have received the many economic and other benefits from the highways that have been completed, and will continue to receive such benefits. The committee does not feel that States who have proceeded with programs to improve their highways systems are being penalized or discriminated against by the provisions of this bill.

SMALL BUSINESS

In the declaration of intent, the House bill includes language to encourage and develop the entry of small business into the highway field, with assurance that a fair proportion of the related contracts

will be placed with small-business concerns. The committee approved these aims, but recognizes the fact that the contracts are awarded by the States on competitive bids, in units that will realize the full economic advantages.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

Regular systems.—The Senate amendment authorizes $200 million additional for fiscal year 1957, and $900 million for each of fiscal years 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961, for the regular Federal-aid systems. The House bill authorizes $25 million additional for fiscal year 1957, $750 million for fiscal year 1958, and $775 million for fiscal year 1959 for those systems. It also declares the intent to provide progressive increases for the 3 categories by not less than $25 million annually through fiscal year 1969. The Senate amendment allots $400 million to the primary system, $300 million to the secondary system, and $200 million to the urban system while the House bill allots 45 percent, 30 percent, and 25 percent, respectively, to those systems.

Interstate System.—Both the Senate amendment and House bill authorize funds for the Interstate System for periods of 13 years, with slightly different allocation for various fiscal years, but with essentially the same total amount. The Senate amendment would apportion these annual authorizations on the basis of existing law, while the House bill proposes such apportionment on the basis of cost estimates for completion of the system in each State, with provision for revision of such estimates and apportionment for subsequent years on the basis of reports submitted at later dates.

Transfer of apportionments.—Both bills authorize a transfer of apportionments of 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State between the systems. Under the House bill transfers may be made only as to funds authorized for the primary, secondary, and urban systems. Under the Senate amendment transfer provisions are applicable to both the regular and Interstate Systems, but the Federal share payable on account of any project constructed with transferred funds is limited to 50 percent.

Public-domain roads.—The annual authorizations for federally built roads on federally owned or controlled lands are slightly larger in the House bill than in the Senate amendment, although the Senate amendment covers the period 1958 through 1961, while the House bill is for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959, with a declaration of intent to continue until June 30, 1969, the authorization at annual rates not less than those for 1958 and 1959. The Senate amendment permits the use of funds for forest development roads and trails to be used for construction of sanitary, water, and fire-control facilities. The House bill repeals the provisions for apportioning funds for forest-development roads and trails on the basis of needs since that formula has been superseded.

The Senate amendment includes $2 million for fiscal years 1956 through 1961 for highways on public lands, while the House bill continues the present authorization of $1 million annually for 1958 and 1959. Both bills continue the contract authority for the roads on Federal domain, with the Senate amendment providing such authority 1 year in advance of the year for which authorized, and the House bill provides such authority 6 months preceding the fiscal

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

year for which authorized if no apportionment is required. The House bill further provides that such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums authorized for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years since and including the fiscal year 1955 shall have been obligated.

Emergency fund.—The House bill increased the authorized emergency highway repair fund from $10 million to $30 million, available for expenditure any time during fiscal year 1956 and thereafter.

Weights and dimensions.—The Senate amendment contains language designed to restrain further increases in weights and dimensions of vehicles using the Interstate System. A similar provision of the House bill applies only to maximum axle weight limitations. Both bills direct expeditious completion of the highway tests on weights and dimensions, and a report and recommendations to the Congress.

Reimbursement policy.—The House bill includes a declaration of intent and policy of Congress to reimburse those States for any portion of a toll or free highway located on the Interstate System, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, and which meets prescribed standards. A study and report to Congress is directed.

Acquisition of right-of-way.—Both bills authorize the Secretary of Commerce to acquire rights-of-way for the Interstate System. The Senate amendment authorizes $100 million for fiscal year 1956, the House bill sets no limit. The House bill permits advancement of funds to States for acquisition of rights-of-way on any Federal-aid highway system, not exceeding the Federal pro-rata share applicable, and providing for reimbursement of the costs and agreement for the actual construction of a road on such rights-of-way within a 5-year period.

Advances to States.—The House bill provides for advance of the Federal share of the cost of construction to States for prompt payments for acquisition of rights-of-way and construction as it progresses. The sums so advanced would be deposited in a special revolving trust fund by the State, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department. Provision is made for repayment of excess funds or on demand.

Prevailing wage rates.—The House bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to take necessary action to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors on the initial construction work performed on authorized projects on the Interstate System shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The Senate amendment has no comparable provision.

Relocation of utility facilities.—The Senate amendment permits reimbursement to States for 50 percent of the cost of utility relocations on all Federal-aid systems, where such relocations are not paid by the States, with a limit of 2 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for each system used for projects on that system. The House bill permits reimbursement to the States whenever they make payments to the utilities for the cost of relocations, in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project, provided that such payment to the utility does not violate the State law or a legal contract between the utility and the State.

Increase in interstate mileage.—The Senate amendment increases the authorized mileage on the Interstate System to 42,500 miles. The House bill contains no such increase.

Progress reports on Interstate System.—The House bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to report to each Congress, beginning with calendar year 1958, details on the Interstate System relative to funds, mileage, progress, and other information. The Senate amendment requires the Secretary to submit his recommendations as to the manner of best utilizing the undesignated mileage of the Interstate System, and a report and recommendations for improving all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems to adequate standards, including extension of the program.

Limiting use of rights-of-way.—Both the House bill and Senate amendment include provisions limiting the addition of access points to or exit points from the Interstate System, without prior approval of the Secretary. The House bill contains additional provisions to insure that users of the Interstate System will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways in such system, that the States will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users to be located on the rights-of-way of such system, but that a State or political subdivision thereof may use the air space above or below the highway pavement for parking motor vehicles, provided that such use does not interfere with the free flow of traffic.

Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels.—The House bill authorizes approval as a part of the Interstate System of any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which forms a logical segment of such system and meets the adopted standards, provided that no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for construction of any toll road except to the extent hereafter permitted by law, with no Federal-aid highway funds expended for construction of any toll bridge or tunnel to the extent now or hereafter permitted by law. The House bill would also permit use of Interstate funds for construction of roads approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to a certain point, and subject to certain conditions.

Bypassing communities.—The Senate amendment requires transmission of transcripts of public hearings by State highway departments on bypassing cities, towns, and communities, to the Commissioner of Public Roads, with certification that economic effects of such a location has been considered.

Definition of construction.—The House bill has amended the definition of construction to include establishment of geodetic markers, cost of relocation of building tenants, and cost of demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites.

Archeological salvage.—The House bill authorizes use of Federal-aid highway funds for the purpose of archeological salvage in an amount approved as necessary by the Governor or authorized highway official of any State.

Mapping.—The House bill provides that to the fullest extent practicable, the use of photogrammetric methods, in mapping and the utilization of commercial enterprises for such services is authorized.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Interstate compacts.—The Senate amendment contains provisions for interstate compacts on toll roads, and a study and report on interstate toll roads as a supplement to the Federal-aid highway system.

Information from States.—The House bill provides that all departments and agencies of any State and of the executive branch of the Government shall furnish to Congress such information, records, documents, or correspondence in their possession relating to the construction of the Interstate System, as requested by the Committee on Public Works or any subcommittee thereof, with provisions for withholding apportioned funds from States which have failed or refuse to comply with a request for such information.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, SENATOR NORRIS COTTON, AND SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA

Although the undersigned voted in committee to substitute S. 1048 (the Gore bill, so-called) for title I of the House bill (H. R. 10660), our vote is not to be construed as an approval of S. 1048. This we stated in the committee, reserving all rights to propose and support amendments in the Senate or to vote to return to the House bill, should it seem desirable. Our vote in committee was based on three considerations:

I. The only alternative to reporting the Senate version was a long drawn-out controversy in which the committee would traverse the same ground and in greater likelihood arrive at the same result as it did last year. The bill must still be acted upon by the Finance Committee, the Senate, and the conference committee. Our vote was to expedite action so that a national highway program may be enacted this session.

II. Amended in our committee to provide a complete 13-year program, the Gore bill now conforms more nearly to the President's program.

III. Although the formula for apportionment of funds to the States under the Gore bill is far from perfect, the method in the House bill is monstrously unfair and discriminatory. Furthermore, its inequities are frozen for 2 years with the hope but by no means the certainty of subsequent correction. The States we represent are among the victims. We could not vote to report the House bill with this glaring injustice.

EDWARD MARTIN.
NORRIS COTTON.
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR PAT McNAMARA

It is my view that H. R. 10660, as it came originally before the Senate Committee on Public Works, is a sound program for highway construction. It should not, in my estimation, be crippled or mutilated. Such efforts will serve only to delay this long-needed action on our highways.

H. R. 10660 is the best overall program that has been presented in either session of the 84th Congress. Even with an extension of the interstate portion of the Senate bill to match that in the House bill, the House bill nevertheless presents the best long-range approach. In such complex and important matters as updating our woefully inadequate highway system, a clear declaration of congressional intent as to long-range development is essential.

The national scope of the interstate system must be emphasized. The House bill presents a sounder approach in that it looks toward the completion of the interstate highway system and apportions funds according to the needs of the States. I recognize that there may be inequities in the "need table" of the House bill, but it should be pointed out that such inequities could be eliminated when, as provided in the House bill, new reviews and estimates of need are made in 1958 and subsequent years.

Some objections might be raised as to the public utility relocation section in the House bill. Yet, this section appears much more fair to the taxpayer than the section of the Senate bill.

Furthermore, the House bill contains a section requiring prevailing wages be paid under the Davis-Bacon Act. It is not contained in the Senate bill. To my mind, this is a vitally important part of any highway legislation, and it should be retained. We cannot permit such huge Federal expenditures under a highway program to be used to continue and, in effect, encourage, unfair wage practices.

PAT MCNAMARA.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

These points seem to me essential in considering differences between the highway bills passed by the House (H. R. 10660) and by the Senate (S. 1048):

1. The sums authorized annually for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and for parkways are more adequate in the House bill than in the Senate amendment. As I stated in the Committee on Public Works, it is my intention to offer an amendment to substitute the House-approved sums for the sums presently in the Senate amendment thereto. Forest development roads in the Pacific Northwest more than pay for themselves in the additional sums made available to the Federal Treasury, through better access to federally owned timber and increased competitive bidding when it is offered for sale. Furthermore, additional access roads in both forests and parks are made necessary by fact that recreational use of these outdoor playgrounds has nearly tripled during recent years. The automobile is the means by which virtually all these additional campers, hikers, fishermen, and hunters reach wilderness realms on Government lands.

The following comparisons will demonstrate why I favor the funds for forest and park road projects, as contained in the House bill, as being more realistic in view of increasing pressures for transportation in these areas:

Roads on Federally owned lands

[Millions]

Type	House bill, fiscal years, 1958–59	Senate amendment, fiscal years, 1958–61
Forest highways	$25	$22.5
Forest development roads and trails	27	24
Park roads and trails	16	12.5
Parkways	16	11
Total, annual	84	70

While these more adequate roads are necessary on Federal public lands, both for economic purposes and to facilitate access to their recreational opportunities in the automobile age, it is at the same time of the utmost importance to avoid invasion of wilderness areas and other roadless areas.

Such areas have been set aside in our national forests to preserve a tiny fraction of our country's land area, less than 1 percent, as completely as possible in the original condition of natural beauty and grandeur as the first explorers found it. No permanent shelters and no machine-driven means of travel are permitted in these areas.

While it might be assumed in any case, I think the record should be clear that planning and construction of roads under the Federal-aid

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

highway program now before us will recognize and respect these roadless areas and the long-standing national conservation objectives which they serve.

2. The Senate amendment should contain the same provisions to protect wage standards on federally financed road projects, modeled on the Davis-Bacon Act, as are contained in the House bill. If the Government can safeguard wage structures and standards of living of men engaged in erecting hospitals and airports with Federal-aid funds, it is no less important and equitable that these safeguards be used to protect the men who build the Nation's major trunk highways.

3. There was proposed in the House an amendment providing for a comprehensive study of highway traffic-safety problems. The amendment was narrowly defeated. Because more than 36,000 Americans perish each year in automobile accidents, to say nothing of many more cruelly injured, and the enormous economic losses from traffic additions, such a study should be authorized and an amendment to that effect should be added to the Senate amendment.

4. The Territory of Alaska is still excluded from this Federal-aid highway legislation, in spite of the fact that this is our nearest land to the Soviet Union, and an expanded Federal highway program is cited by the administration as being crucial to national defense. Why should Hawaii and Puerto Rico be included and Alaska eliminated? Such discrimination makes neither rhyme nor reason.

Furthermore, residents of Alaska will pay the road and vehicle taxes included in title II of H. R. 10660, without sharing in the benefits made available by title I. This is the epitome of taxation not only without representation, but also without reciprocity. I plan to sponsor an amendment to bring Alaska within the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, but with some modification as to formula, so that Alaska's vast area will not make disproportionate the benefits thus conferred.

5. Although I believe that the House bill is more adequate and realistic as to the overall highway needs of the Nation, I have voted to substitute the language of the Senate bill for one basic and decisive reason. This is the difference in the formulas by which the authorized funds would be distributed under the two measures.

In the Senate amendment the Federal funds for the Interstate System are distributed according to a formula which is fair and which protects the interests and welfare of all States. Under this section of the Senate amendment, one-half of the funds are apportioned according to the existing formula, which has been in effect with general acceptance since the year 1921. That formula is predicated one-third on a State's population, one-third on area, and one-third on rural-postal-route mileage in the State. The other 50 percent of funds for the Interstate System under the Senate amendment is based wholly on population.

Thus, in the Senate amendment, there is a fixed and definite formula. The standards are there for all to see. The yardstick is the same for every State. What the census has disclosed, what geography has accomplished, and what the Post Office Department has specified as rural and star mail routes—these factors decide the distribution of highway funds.

But in the House bill, the time-tested formula which has existed since 1921 has been junked. The whole distribution in the House

bill is fixed according to what is described as needs. In other words, if one State highway department decides that it wants its interstate roads equipped with split-brick retaining walls and fog lights, then its needs are obviously far greater than those of States with less pretentious ambitions. In fairness to all States, can we permit self-assessment of different States' highways needs any more than we could dispense with Federal standards for aid to State public welfare, old-age assistance, hospital construction, or other matching fund programs?

As a Senator from a State with only 1 percent of the national population, I fear that abandonment of fixed statutory standards in favor of any nebulous apportionment of highway funds will inevitably work to the ultimate disadvantage of all the States with relatively small populations and accordingly with small congressional delegations and electoral strength. The protection of the smaller States is to be found in a definite formula. Such a formula cannot be violated and is beyond administrative caprice, while distribution of funds predicated on needs can mean anything the Secretary of Commerce desires it to mean.

I favor a statutory formula of apportionment of Federal highway construction funds among the States. For this single, compelling reason I have voted to substitute the terms of S. 1048 for title I of H. R. 10660. In other, less-fundamental features, I believe sections of H. R. 10660 are preferable and might be added to the Senate amendment. But I cannot vote for a bill under which Oregon, with a population of 1,670,000, would have to seek its share of funds for the Interstate System of Highways on the basis of needs, along with the most populous State, New York, with its population of 16 million. In that kind of competition, States like Oregon will not fare well in the long run. In addition, the administrative method of apportionment of H. R. 10660, even with its provision for review by the congressional Committees on Public Works, risks plunging the distribution of Federal-aid highway construction funds into repeated controversy and making it subject to attempts at introducing political considerations.

We have avoided such a calamity for many decades. Let us not risk it now. The fixed formula of the past, modified slightly to keep pace with changing population patterns, is a far more prudent method of allocating our highway funds from Federal sources than according to something as intangible and indefinite as needs.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

I oppose the committee's substitute for title I of H. R. 10660 because—

1. The apportionment formula is so unrealistic that its application would have the following results:

(*a*) It would not build the National System of Interstate Highways.

(*b*) It would freeze $3,452,200,000 of taxes in the United States Treasury.

(*c*) It could result in a windfall to some States totaling $1,324,800,000, at the same time that other States have insufficient funds to complete the system.

2. It makes no provision for equitable treatment of States which have had the initiative to build free or toll highways eligible to be included in the Interstate System.

I, therefore, favor the following amendments:

1. Use the apportionment provisions of H. R. 10660 which—

(*a*) Will build the system;

(*b*) Will use all of the tax collections contemplated to be used;

(*c*) Will result in no inequitable windfalls.

2. Add section 109 of H. R. 10660 to the substitute and thus declare the intent of Congress with respect to free and toll roads serving the Interstate System, and provide for a study with respect thereto. Also add section 116 of H. R. 10660, thus authorizing the integration of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels in the Interstate System and the use of Federal funds for approaches to them.

The American people want a completed National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. There can be no question of their desire for this. It is evident from the press; more evident from the support given H. R. 10660 by all of the organizations interested or expert in road problems; and most evident from the overwhelming vote of 388 to 19 by the House when it adopted H. R. 10660.

Why then should the majority of the committee recommend a substitute which clearly does not give the American people what they desire; that is a completed National Interstate Highway System? I heard no reasons advanced in the committee, and can think of none that would warrant the United States Senate in not complying with the popular will in this matter.

The substitute will not build the National Interstate System. The reason is simple and obvious. Nineteen States, including the District of Columbia, will not receive enough cash to cover the cost of construction of the National Insterstate System in their particular States. The table which follows indicates the total funds apportioned under the substitute, and the total estimated cost in each State. One State would receive only 38 percent of this estimated cost. The total deficit in these States would be the staggering sum of $4,852 million. What are these States to do?

Comparison of apportionments for Interstate System under H. R. 10660 as passed by House and as reported out by Senate Committee on Public Works

[Federal funds, millions of dollars]

State	13- year apportionment under H. R. 10660 as—		Comparison of Senate version with need		Percentage of Interstate System needs met by—	
	Passed by House [1] (based on estimated costs)	Reported by Senate committee [2]	Excess	Deficiency	House bill	Senate committee version
Alabama	$390.1	$502.8	$112.7		100	129
Arizona	223.4	283.6	60.2		100	127
Arkansas	216.3	359.6	143.3		100	166
California	2,477.9	1,411.4		$1,066.5	100	57
Colorado	166.1	338.3	172.2		100	202
Connecticut	593.4	238.3		355.1	100	40
Delaware	69.9	154.7	84.8		100	220
Florida	528.9	420.8		108.1	100	80
Georgia	747.2	576.8		170.4	100	77
Idaho	114.1	250.5	136.4		100	220
Illinois	1,137.2	1,166.9	29.7		100	103
Indiana	926.2	602.1		324.1	100	65
Iowa	295.5	505.6	210.1		100	173
Kansas	221.0	449.2	228.2		100	204
Kentucky	526.1	464.2		61.9	100	89
Louisiana	526.1	408.5		117.6	100	78
Maine	156.7	199.0	42.3		100	127
Maryland	464.1	296.9		167.2	100	64
Massachusetts	893.7	528.4		365.3	100	59
Michigan	1,382.5	889.8		492.7	100	65
Minnesota	516.5	557.6	41.1		100	108
Mississippi	263.1	372.5	129.4		100	150
Missouri	637.8	670.4	32.6		100	105
Montana	163.8	355.5	191.7		100	218
Nebraska	114.1	355.0	240.9		100	315
Nevada	79.1	258.4	179.3		100	333
New Hampshire	72.1	154.7	82.6		100	220
New Jersey	1,449.9	542.1		907.8	100	38
New Mexico	250.7	300.5	49.8		100	120
New York	1,427.3	1,754.6	327.3		100	123
North Carolina	263.1	631.0	367.9		100	240
North Dakota	114.1	274.4	160.3		100	241
Ohio	1,452.1	1,059.8		392.3	100	73
Oklahoma	402.0	442.8	40.8		100	110
Oregon	339.8	336.0		3.8	100	99
Pennsylvania	811.5	1,326.8	515.3		100	164
Rhode Island	131.7	154.7	23.0		100	118
South Carolina	196.3	332.8	136.5		100	171
South Dakota	101.7	286.6	184.9		100	283
Tennessee	404.9	529.2	124.3		100	131
Texas	930.8	1,422.4	491.6		100	153
Utah	252.8	241.2		11.6	100	95
Vermont	188.6	154.7		33.9	100	82
Virginia	608.2	501.0		107.2	100	83
Washington	499.0	397.5		101.5	100	80
West Virginia	275.5	294.8	19.3		100	107
Wisconsin	345.2	563.7	218.5		100	164
Wyoming	315.5	257.2		58.3	100	82
District of Columbia	161.4	154.7		6.7	100	96
Total	24,825.0	24,750.0	4,777.0	4,852.0	100	100

[1] Apportioned according to needs based on H. Doc. No. 120, 84th Cong.; apportionments subsequent to fiscal 1957 and 1958 subject to revisions based on periodic reestimate of needs.
[2] Apportioned one half according to population and one half according to formula for primary funds.
[3] For the purposes of this table the total deficiency of $75 million of the proposed substitute has been ignored.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Last year the argument was made that the estimate of costs might be inaccurate and, therefore, should not be used as a basis for the apportionment of Federal funds. That argument no longer has any merit whatsoever in view of the provisions contained in paragraph (f) of section 108 of H. R. 10660. These provisions call for periodic studies to be made of the estimated costs of completion of the Interstate System, and for reports showing the results of those studies to be furnished the Congress in 1958, 1962, 1966, 1967, and 1968. These studies must be made in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of Commerce and applied by him uniformly to all of the States. These provisions clearly will require correction of any inaccuracies in the present estimates. Accordingly, the argument over inaccuracies no longer has any merit.

What other possible reason can be advanced to justify the apportionment to a number of the States of insufficient funds to complete the National Interstate System? Can we say that merely because in past years a certain formula has been used that we should blindly follow that formula for the rest of time? Of course not. That formula was useful in distributing Federal dollars for aid in the construction of highways. It was not intended to provide for the completion of a national system of designated and limited mileage. The old concept of merely providing aid is no longer applicable to the National Interstate System. The American people desire that system to be completed within a given period of time, and the only possible way to accomplish this purpose is to provide the funds in each State necessary to cover the costs of construction.

But that is not the whole story. A further reference to the table indicates that 30 States would be allotted more funds than necessary to complete the Interstate System. What will become of these excess funds, totaling $4,777 million? At least $3,452,200,000 of these excess funds will be frozen in the trust fund in the United States Treasury. This huge sum will not be used for building roads. It will not be used for building anything. It will stay in the Treasury of the United States invested in Government bonds. How can the United States Senate agree to raising taxes for the purpose of building roads, and then let such a substantial sum as this lie useless in the Treasury? American taxpayers would properly resent such fiscal irresponsibility.

Not only would the American taxpayer be deceived by this apportionment formula in the committee substitute, but the Senators themselves would be misled. The majority report carries a table showing the apportionments for the Interstate System which shows a certain amount of dollars opposite the name of each State. Senators from those States, which you think would receive an excess of dollars over the estimated cost of the Interstate System, beware! Take care! All that glitters is not gold, nor are all of the dollars apparently apportioned to your State going to benefit the State. As indicated above, a total of $3,452,200,000 will never be used by any State.

However, it is true that some States may receive a windfall at the expense of other States. It will not be all of the excess dollars apportioned, but some of them. The windfall to these States could total $1,324,800,000, but it is unlikely to reach this maximum. Funds not used as a windfall will be added to the frozen funds.

This windfall could result from a transfer of funds from the Interstate System to the primary or secondary systems under section 103 of the substitute, which permits 20 percent of the amounts apportioned

to be so transferred. There is no reason in justice or fairness why one State should get a windfall at the expense of another. This only occurs because interstate funds are being apportioned on a completely unrealistic formula which creates a surplus in some States and a deficit in others.

What is the reason given for using such an unrealistic formula? The only apparent reason is the belief of the majority that the estimates of the cost of construction of the National Interstate System made by the various State highway departments are inaccurate. In spite of this alleged inaccuracy, the majority use the total of these estimates as the basis of the amount which they authorize for the National Interstate System. Accordingly, while they question the accuracy of the estimates, they use approximately the same total used in H. R. 10660. But after using the total estimate as a basis for their authorizations, they abandon the estimate entirely and use formulas designed for another purpose.

Contrast this apportionment with the carefully drawn provisions of H. R. 10660 which limit the States' participation in Federal funds to the amounts needed to complete the construction of the system. When a State estimates that it needs no further funds to complete the system, it will receive no further apportionment of Federal funds for the system. The taxpayers' money is not frozen, nor used for windfalls, since the funds purported to be used for the completion of the National Interstate System are in fact used for that purpose and no other.

The American people have indicated their willingness to pay additional taxes, but it is crystal clear that they would be very unwilling to pay taxes to be distributed under an apportionment formula which freezes a substantial amount in the United States Treasury, which gives an inequitable windfall to some States, and insufficient funds to others with the net total result that the National Interstate System will not be completed with the increased taxes provided.

In conclusion on this point, I wish to emphasize that this is a national system designed to benefit the economy of the Nation as a whole, as well as the defense of the Nation as a whole. It is not designed for the benefit of one State or another, but for the United States of America. What other justification could there be for using 90 percent Federal funds? The people of this country want a National Interstate Highway System. The State highway officials and other road experts want it. An overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives want it. Why then should the Senate stop it? The reasons for stopping it, if any there are, should be sound, logical, and based on clear, indisputable, well-recorded facts—not on impressions, beliefs, isolated instances, and matters not testified to before the committee.

The substitute contains no provision whatsoever with respect to States which have constructed toll or free highways eligible for inclusion on the National Interstate System. The Clay committee recommended reimbursement in these States according to certain formulas contained in section 207 of S. 1160. Objections were raised to these provisions for reimbursement. The principal objection was the uncertainty involved because it is unknown to date as to the mileage of these roads that will be included on the Interstate System and eligible for reimbursement.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In order to meet this objection, but at the same time show clearly an intention on the part of Congress to be equitable in this matter, the House committee inserted section 109 in H. R. 10660. This section contains a declaration of policy with respect to reimbursement of certain highways in the following words:

> It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse those States for any portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System.

This section then requires the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments to determine which highways measure up to the standards required for the Interstate System, and to give all relevant facts concerning the reimbursable costs of such highways. The approach to this problem contained in section 109 is a fair and reasonable one. It contains a declaration of policy to indicate that there is equity in reimbursing those States which have already constructed eligible toll and free roads. At the same time, it does not go into the matter blindly, but calls for a report of all of the factors involved. Two years from now Congress with the facts before it can enact fair and wise legislation to take care of this problem.

The original Federal highway legislation of 1916 contained a provision that all roads constructed under the provisions of that act should be free from tolls of all kinds. Certain toll roads have been constructed without the aid of Federal funds and are located on routes of the Interstate System. It would be unsound economically to construct roads paralleling these roads. Yet, if these roads were not part of the system, we would not have a fully integrated system.

In order to take account of this situation, the House committee inserted section 116 in H. R. 10660. This section permits the Secretary of Commerce to approve as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel which meets the standards of the Interstate System whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of that system. Such inclusion would be for purposes of integration only. This same section also makes provision for approaches to these toll facilities and permits the expenditure of Federal funds on such approaches subject to the conditions therein stated. This entire section 116 is one which clarified the intent of Congress and is considered essential for a proper administration of the act. It should be included in the substitute.

PRESCOTT BUSH.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL

The Senate of the United States will do a tragic disservice to the people of this Nation if it fails speedily to approve the Interstate Highway bill already passed by the House of Representatives.

While I do not approve every provision of the House-approved bill, I enthusiastically endorse its recognition of the Nation's need for a modern and efficient Interstate Highway system of 40,000 miles, and its realistic provisions to achieve that goal.

I need not here elaborate on the need for such a modern highway system. Suffice to say that a nonpartisan, Presidentially appointed committee has dramatically demonstrated that our country indispensably requires it by reason of military defense, civil defense, domestic economy, and—last but not least—of taking all possible steps to lessen, if not to eliminate, the slaughter which highway accidents annually entail.

The House bill is authored by a Democrat. I am a Republican. I support it because, in my judgment, it offers the Congress the best opportunity of meeting a crying, and long-overdue need.

The Senate Committee on Public Works has struck down the House bill and has substituted what to all intents, is a new proposal for Senate action.

The substitute is wrong, as I view it, for the following reasons:

1. It will not build a 40,000-mile Interstate Highway System that will bring our outmoded national highway system up to standards that will meet the peacetime and emergency needs of our Nation.
2. The apportionment formula is so completely unrealistic that obvious inequalities between States will arise.
3. The tax features of title II of H. R. 10660 are thrown out of balance.
4. It does not contain a provision to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on the construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276–a).

Last year when the Senate passed the so-called Gore bill, I stood firmly in opposition to the unwise and unfortunate motion on the floor which removed the prevailing rate of wage provisions (Davis-Bacon Act) from the bill. I strongly believe in the prevailing-wage principle. It represents good and decent Government. It prevents the great purchasing power of the public purse from being used to destroy stable labor standards voluntarily established by management and labor. The prevailing-wage principle merely seeks to preserve

90003°—57 S. Rept., 84–2, vol. 3——20

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and maintain the going rates already established in every community of the country. This is certainly commonsense. It is certainly common justice.

If the so-called Gore bill were enacted into law, it would fail to accomplish the objectives of the 40,000-mile Interstate National Highway System. The Gore bill fails to provide an apportionment formula that will meet the balanced program found in H. R. 10660. In this connection, I point out the following:

(*a*) In order for the proposed Federal highway program to be successful in providing the roads the country needs, there must be a balanced program that recognizes the needs of all types of roads and the varying abilities of individual States to provide the matching funds.

(*b*) While both H. R. 10660 (Fallon bill) and the so-called Gore bill provide for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways on a 90–10 matching basis over a 13-year period, there are great differences in the manner in which the needs of other roads will be met.

(*c*) H. R. 10660 provides funds for the regular Federal aid primary roads, secondary roads, and urban extensions, as well as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways over the full 13-year period, and does so in a manner that relates to the needs of the different highway systems. It is this that makes H. R. 10660 a balanced program, whereas,

(*d*) the so-called Gore bill provides only a 5-year program for the primary roads, secondary roads, and urban extensions. Moreover, it provides for these roads in a manner that, as I see it, is not related to the funds that will be available for the Interstate System, nor to the ability of the various States to provide the necessary matching funds.

(*e*) Under H. R. 10660, the present regular Federal aid authorization of $700 million annually for roads other than the Interstate System will be increased to $725 million in 1957. Each year thereafter, a minimum of $25 million will be added, with a possible maximum annual authorization of $1,025,000 being reached in 1969, the final year of the program. These funds will be available to the States under the traditional 50-50 matching basis.

(*f*) The gradual acceleration of funds for the roads other than the Interstate System, as provided in H. R. 10660, is more closely coordinated with the funds that will be available for the interstate roads. Appropriations for the interstate system will start at $1,200 million for the first year; reach a peak of $2,300 million in 1964 and taper off to $1,000 million for 1969, the final year of the program. As funds for the other roads will increase each year, reaching a peak in the final year, there is an important relationship between the two phases of the program. This relationship assures a more balanced program which gives necessary recognition to the financing and technical problems within the various States.

(*g*) Many States which will have no difficulty in matching funds for the Interstate System under the 90–10 ratio will be faced with a serious problem if at the same time they are offered greatly increased funds for the other road systems under a 50–50

matching ratio. In fact, there are some States in which funds to match such appropriations will not be available. However, if the funds for the other roads were available on a gradual accelerated basis the matching problem will solve itself. As the Interstate System is brought up to standard, the increased road use will mean additional highway tax revenues at prevailing rates and this in turn will mean funds available to match the accelerated funds available on a 50–50 basis. This is the type of program presented by H. R. 10660.

(*h*) By contrast, the Gore substitute would make available greatly increased funds for the regular Federal-aid roads on a 50–50 basis together with the funds for the Interstate System. This would represent more of a financial bite than many States are prepared to swallow at one time. By increasing the regular Federal aid by $200 million annually, and providing this same amount each year over a 5-year period, the Gore substitute fails to coordinate the needs of the other roads with those of the Interstate System. Ultimately, under H. R. 10660 more money will be authorized for the other Federal-aid roads but it will be done in a manner that is consistent with overall highway needs and the varying requirements of the States.

(*i*) I have attached hereto a table showing a comparison of approximate Federal appropriations for interstate highways based on needs as provided in H. R. 10660 compared with a distribution of the same money as provided in the Gore bill. A study of this comparison will quickly demonstrate the validity of the issues that I have raised in my objections.

The tax provisions of H. R. 10660 have been carefully related to the full 13-year program for all road systems in the manner provided in the bill. The Gore bill makes no provision for regular Federal-aid roads after the 5-year period breaks this relationship and would require a complete reappraisal of the tax features of the bill by the Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Comparison of approximate Federal appropriations for interstate highways, based on needs under the Fallon bill (H. R. 10660), compared with a distribution of the same money on the basis of the Gore bill (S. 1048)

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Distribution of needs—Fallon bill		Gore bill allocation formula used to distribute Fallon bill needs	
	Total	Average, annual	Total	Average, annual
Alabama	$389,752	$29,981	$511,395	$39,338
Arizona	223,425	17,186	283,005	21,770
Arkansas	215,978	16,614	359,962	27,689
California	2,477,535	190,580	1,410,060	108,466
Colorado	166,328	12,794	332,655	25,589
Connecticut	593,318	45,640	238,320	18,332
Delaware	69,510	5,347	156,398	12,031
Florida	528,772	40,675	422,025	32,463
Georgia	747,232	57,479	583,388	44,876
Idaho	114,195	8,784	250,732	19,287
Illinois	1,136,985	87,460	1,169,258	89,943
Indiana	925,972	71,229	608,212	46,786
Iowa	295,418	22,724	511,395	39,338
Kansas	220,942	16,996	456,780	35,137
Kentucky	526,290	40,484	464,228	35,710
Louisiana	526,290	40,484	407,120	31,318
Maine	156,398	12,031	201,082	15,468
Maryland	464,228	35,710	295,418	22,724
Massachusetts	893,700	68,746	526,290	40,484
Michigan	1,382,752	106,366	891,218	68,555
Minnesota	516,360	39,720	563,528	43,348
Mississippi	263,145	20,242	397,200	30,554
Missouri	638,002	49,077	680,205	52,323
Montana	163,845	12,603	350,032	26,926
Nebraska	114,195	8,784	352,515	27,117
Nevada	79,440	6,111	258,181	19,860
New Hampshire	71,993	5,538	156,398	12,031
New Jersey	1,449,780	111,522	541,185	41,630
New Mexico	250,732	19,287	300,382	23,106
New York	1,427,438	109,803	1,755,128	135,010
North Carolina	263,145	20,242	633,038	48,695
North Dakota	114,195	8,784	278,040	21,388
Ohio	1,452,262	111,712	1,064,992	81,922
Oklahoma	402,165	30,936	446,850	34,373
Oregon	340,102	26,162	335,138	25,780
Pennsylvania	811,778	62,444	1,318,208	101,401
Rhode Island	131,572	10,121	156,398	12,031
South Carolina	196,118	15,086	337,620	25,971
South Dakota	101,782	7,829	292,935	22,533
Tennessee	404,648	31,127	533,738	41,057
Texas	930,938	71,611	1,427,438	109,803
Utah	253,215	19,478	240,802	18,523
Vermont	188,670	14,513	156,398	12,031
Virginia	608,212	46,786	501,465	38,574
Washington	498,983	38,383	397,200	30,554
West Virginia	275,558	21,197	295,418	22,724
Wisconsin	345,068	26,544	568,492	43,730
Wyoming	315,278	24,252	250,732	19,287
Hawaii	0	0	156,398	12,031
District of Columbia	161,362	12,412		
Puerto Rico	0	0		
Total	24,825,000	1,909,615	24,825,000	1,909,615